

Appl. No. : 09/681,570
Filed : May 1, 2001

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

Initially, the indication that claims 7, 16, 18 and 21 represent allowable subject matter is appreciatively noted. These claims are retained.

Claim 15 stands rejected based on Guthrie, and claim 15 has been canceled in order to obviate the rejections thereto.

Claims 19 and 20 stand rejected as being unpatentable based on Wood. However, this contention is respectfully traversed. The cited portion of Wood, and specifically, column 2 lines 27-67 describe that the credentials can be upgraded during a session. As explained column 2 line 51, the initial login may use credentials that are suitable for one or more resources. The user may then require access to resources that require authentication at a higher level. The system therefore allows upgrading those credentials. Note, however, examples of the specific kinds of resources that are contemplated. One particular resource is an enterprise application, see column 6 line 30. Column 7 line 63 just refers to these as *applications* and/or resources (emphasis added). Column 17 beginning at line 65 describes that the resource can have a function or facility, but again does not describe the resource as being a file. In general, Wood apparently contemplates that the resource to which the access is granted is not in fact a file; but is rather an application.

In any case, and even assuming *arguendo* that Wood contemplated security access to files in the same way as claimed, nowhere is there any teaching or suggestion that the user is allowed access to the computer, but required to re-identify

Appl. No. : 09/681,570
Filed : May 1, 2001

themselves to the computer when they attempt to access a higher security file. Wood teaches upgrading the user's credentials, but does not teach or suggest anything about reidentifying, NOR only allowing access to some files but not to others. In fact, Wood only describes this in terms of resources, where the resources are implied to be applications. Therefore, claim 19 should be additionally allowable.

In rejecting claim 20, the rejection draws attention to column 2 lines 11-13 which simply describes identifiers associated with users. Column 4 lines 8-12 describes the information resource, but teaches nothing about high security files of the type claimed. Column 5 lines 55-57 describe information resources, and again implies that this refers to applications, not files.

Claims 1-3 and 6 stand rejected over Murphy in view of Guthrie. The limitations of claim 2 have been incorporated into claim 1, and have also been clarified to show that the computer detects movement from a first surrounding by a predetermined relative distance, which distinguishes over Murphy's detection of a region, which is an absolute, not relative, measurement.

The rejection notes that Murphy teaches a system in which the decryption chip has a built-in positioning system. The decryption chip is licensed only for use in a specified market, and can be used only in that market. When the chip moves outside a region corresponding to that market, the chip is disabled. This, however, only detects

The rejection apparently combines this with the basic login scheme of Guthrie, and alleges that the login scheme of Guthrie could be used with region specific operation as disclosed in the decryption chip.

Appl. No. : **09/681,570**
Filed : **May 1, 2001**

Amended claim 1 includes the limitations of claim 2, and also makes it clear that the computer is caused to lock when it is detected to read moved by a predetermined absolute distance. This distinguishes over the region locking of Murphy. Murphy does not contemplate anything about relative distance as claimed, but rather only cares about the absolute location. Murphy never teaches or suggests anything about causing the computer to lock when the device has moved by a specified relative distance. Therefore, claim 1 should be allowable along with claims which depend therefrom. The remaining dependent claims should be allowable for analogous reasons.

Claim 8 was apparently rejected based on analogous rationale. Claim 8 is similarly amended to change the word "threshold" to a "relative amount of distance". Therefore, this claim should be allowable along with the claims which depend therefrom.

Claim 15 is canceled, and claim 16 which was indicated as allowable, is amended into independent form.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.


Appl. No. : 09/681,570
Filed : May 1, 2001

For all of these reasons, it is respectfully suggested that all of the claims should be in condition for allowance. A formal notice of allowance is hence respectfully requested.

Please charge any fees due in connection with this response to Deposit Account No. 50-1387.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7-7-04



Scott C. Harris
Reg. No. 32,030

Customer No. 23844
Scott C. Harris, Esq.
P.O. Box 927649
San Diego, CA 92192
Telephone: (619) 823-7778
Facsimile: (858) 678-5082